



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,277	05/30/2001	Carsten Thormod Pedersen	060258-0282898	7410
909	7590	10/16/2008		
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 10500			KARMIS, STEFANOS	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/870,277	Applicant(s) PEDERSEN ET AL.
	Examiner STEFANOS KARMIS	Art Unit 3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-9,11-14 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-9,11-14 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 13 June 2008.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11-14 are currently amended. Claims 17-20 are newly added. Therefore claims 2-9, 11-14 and 17-20 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 2-9, 11-14 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 2 and 3-6 recite a method for calculating a subscriber's account balance in a telecommunications system...comprising the steps of defining, maintaining, determining, comparing and updating. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should

positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the system or apparatus that accomplishes the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Examiner also notes that a nominal tie (i.e. merely putting "A computer implemented method" in the preamble) is not sufficient. Therefore claims 2 and 3-6 are considered non-statutory.

Claims 8-11 and 20 are considered non-statutory. Independent claims 8 and 20 recite an "arrangement for updating a subscriber's account balance...the arrangement configured to" determine, compare, update and detect. This is considered non-statutory because an "arrangement" is not considered to be a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. The Examiner is not clear what statutory class an arrangement belongs to. Therefore claims 8-11 and 20 are rejected as being non-statutory.

Claims 12-14 and 17-19 are considered non-statutory. Independent claims 12 and 14 recite various mechanisms (a first mechanism, a second mechanism, a third mechanism). This is considered non-statutory because it is unclear if the mechanisms are considered software or hardware. If the mechanisms are software, then the mechanisms are considered software, per se which is non-statutory. Amendments or remarks pointing out the structure of the claim or the hardware that makes up the mechanisms would over come this rejection. Therefore claims 12-14 and 17-19 are considered non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 8-11 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 8 and 20 recite an “arrangement for updating a subscriber’s account balance...the arrangement configured to” determine, compare, update and detect. This is considered indefinite “arrangement” fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Therefore claims 8-11 and 20 are rejected as being indefinite.

7. Claims 12-14 and 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12-14 and 17-19 are considered indefinite. Independent claims 12 and 14 recite various mechanisms (a first mechanism, a second mechanism, a third mechanism). This is considered indefinite because it is unclear if the mechanisms are considered software or hardware. If the mechanisms are software, then the mechanisms are considered software, per se which is non-statutory. Amendments or remarks pointing out the structure of the claim or the hardware that makes up the mechanisms would over come this rejection. Therefore claims 12-14 and 17-19 are considered non-statutory.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEFANOS KARMIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Respectfully Submitted
/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693
09 October 2008